

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAVIER ANGEL MALDONADO,
Plaintiff,
v.
COUNTY OF TULARE, CALIFORNIA,
and MICHAEL BOURDREAUX,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:22-cv-01518-HBK
ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE STIPULATED
PROTECTIVE ORDER
(Doc. No. 14)

Pending before the Court is the parties' request for approval of the proposed stipulated protective order filed on April 6, 2023. (Doc. No. 14). The Court denies the request, without prejudice, because the proposed protective order does not comply with the Court's Local Rules.

More specifically, the proposed protective order does not define with any specificity what materials are protected. Notably, the term "confidential" is defined as follows:

'CONFIDENTIAL' Information or Items: information (regardless of how it is generated, stored or maintained) or tangible things that qualify for protection under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(c).

(Doc. No. 14 at 1, ¶ 2.2). Similarly, "PROTECTED MATERIAL" is defined as "any Disclosure or Discovery material that is designated as "CONFIDENTIAL."'" (*Id.* at 2-3, ¶ 2.13). Such language is too broad and not compliant with this Court's Local Rules. Specifically, Eastern District of California Local Rule 141.1(c) requires that every proposed protective order contain the following:

[a] description of the types of information eligible for protection under the order, with the description provided in general terms sufficient to reveal the nature of the information (e.g., customer list, formula for soda, diary of a troubled child); (2) [a] showing of particularized need for protection as to each category of information proposed to be covered by the order; and (3) [a] showing as to why the need for protection should be addressed by a court order, as opposed to a private agreement between or among the parties.” (paragraph breaks omitted.)

Eastern District of California Local Rule 141.1(c).

The parties have failed to comply with Local Rule 141.1(c). The parties have included a catchall description of confidential information and such description is not sufficient “in general terms [] to reveal the nature of the information” under Local Rule 141.1(c)(1). Further, the parties also have not made a showing of particularized need for protection as to each category or explained why a court order is necessary, as opposed to a private agreement between the parties.

Id.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED**:

The parties’ request for approval of the proposed stipulated protective order (Doc. No. 14) is DENIED, without prejudice, to refiling a stipulated protective order that complies with Local Rule 141.1(c).

Dated: April 7, 2023


HELENA M. BARCH-KUCHTA
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE